

Interview Summary Comments

Attorney intimated that the prior art, 2003/0016655 did not teach the delay between the mobile node and the home agent, and the prior art, 6,195,705 taught delay from one router to the next. Also, if applicant filed an RCE, a Non-Final office action or an Allowance should be the first response to the RCE and not a response of a Final office action. Further, examiner had concerns about the clarity of the proposed amended claim language. Attorney explained the proposed amended claim language, but would review to ensure the clarity of the submitted claim language.